

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. While a report on the appearance of an anti-Kerry "documentary" days before the election may be a "news event," actually AIRING that entire documentary is not. My objection is not fueled by my party affiliation. Airing of any such attack "documentary," no matter which candidate is the subject of the attack, is simply not "news." Airing Michael Moore's "Fahrenheit 9/11" would be equally reprehensible under the circumstances. Sinclair must know this, and its intentions in this regard are an illegal, improper and a blatantly dishonest use of the public airways. I expect the FCC to address this issue.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.